



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/807,299

03/24/2004

Jang-woo Lee

1572.1277

3831

21171 7590 06/08/2007  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/08/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/807,299

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Leonid Shapiro

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 7 and 10-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 5, 6, 8 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12-12-05</u>  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitation of independent claims 10,13: "a first display property setting" and claim 23: "displaying the combined image includes displaying one of the portion of the first video signal and the second video signal as a main screen and the other first video and second video signal as a sub screen" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The limitation of the limitation of independent claims 10,13: "a first display property setting" and claim 23: "displaying the combined image includes displaying one of the portion of the first video signal and the second video signal as a main screen and the other first video and second video signal as a sub screen" is not present in the Specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 10-19, 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitation of the limitation of independent claims 10 and 13: "a first display property setting" and claim 23: "displaying the combined image includes displaying one

of the portion of the first video signal and the second video signal as a main screen and the other first video and second video signal as a sub screen" is not shown in Specification or Figures.

Claims 11-13 are depend on claim 10.

Claims 14-19 are depend on claim 13.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear what is "the **other** first video and second video signal as a sub screen".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 10-11,13-17,19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rumreich et al. (6,088,064).

As to claims 10 and 13, Rumreich et al. teaches a system for simultaneously displaying video images resulting from a plurality of video signals (col. 1, lines 26-32), comprising:

a video processor receiving a first video signal (fig. 3, item 334) and a second video signal (fig. 3, item AUX VIDEO), wherein the video processor generates an image signal that includes portions of the first video signal and the second video signal and the portions retains a second display property setting (fig. 2, items 202,208,210);

a display receiving and displaying the image signal from the video processor, wherein the portion of the image signal corresponding to the second video signal includes the second display property setting (fig. 2, items 202,208,210, col. 3, lines 31-58); and

a controller controlling the video processor to display the combined video signals with the different display properties that correspond to the second video signal (fig.3, items 324,326,328,330, col.4, lines 13-29).

As to claim 14, Rumreich et al. teaches a memory receiving and storing default display property values corresponding to a video signal source corresponding to the second video signal (col.4, lines 21-29).

As to claims 15-16, Rumreich et al. teaches a memory receiving and storing display property values in response to input selection commands from a user corresponding to the second video signal (col.4, lines 21-29).

As to claims 11,17, Rumreich et al. teaches the user interface includes an on screen display (fig. 2, items 202,208,210, col. 3, lines 31-58).

As to claim 19, Rumreich et al. teaches the video processor generates the image signal so that one of the first video signal and the second video signal is a main display screen and the remaining first and second video signal is a sub display screen (fig. 2, items 202,208,210).

As to claim 20, Rumreich et al. teaches a method of displaying a combined video signal from two separate video signals (col. 1, lines 26-32), comprising:

receiving a first video signal from a first source (fig. 3, item 334);

receiving a second video signal from a second source (fig. 3, item AUX VIDEO);

generating a combined video signal that includes at least a portion of the first and second video signals (fig. 3, items 334, AUX VIDEO), wherein the first and second video signals have different display properties applied to the first and second video signals respectively (fig.3, items 324,326,328,330, col.4, lines 13-29) ; and

displaying the combined video signal as an image on a display (fig.2, items 202,210).

As to claim 21, Rumreich et al. teaches receiving a user input selection command corresponding to display properties associated with the second source (col.4, lines 13-21).

As to claim 22, Rumreich et al. teaches storing a plurality of display property values corresponding to the second source; and reading the stored display property values and generating the combined image signal based on the read display property values (col.4, lines 21-29).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1,3-4,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rumreich et al. in view of McNeely et al. (4,890,162).

As to claims 1,7 Rumreich et al. teaches a display device (col. 1, lines 26-32) comprising:

a video processor which performs a PIP (Picture In Picture) signal process displaying one of the converted PC signal (fig.3, item 334) and the decoded external input signal as a main screen and the other one as a sub main screen (fig. 3, item AUX VIDEO), thereby enabling the converted PC signal and the decoded external input signal to be displayable on a display (fig. 2, items 202,208,210);

a memory storing different display property values setup depending on the external signal inputter (fig. 3, col. 4, lines 21-29); and

a controller controlling the PIP signal process of the video processor based on an external signal, reading the display property values from the memory, and controlling the decoded external input signal depending on the read display property values (fig. 3, col. 4, lines 21-29).



Rumreich et al. does not disclose an A/D (Analog/Digital) converter receiving and converting an analog personal computer (PC) signal into a digital signal; a decoder receiving and decoding external input signals from an external signal inputter and outputting the external input signals as a digital signal.

McNeely et al. teaches an A/D (Analog/Digital) converter receiving and converting an analog personal computer (PC) signal into a digital signal; a decoder receiving and decoding external input signals from an external signal inputter and outputting the external input signals as a digital signal (fig. 2, items 16,18, col. 3, lines 29-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings McNeely et al. into Rumreich et al. system in order to have a picture-in-picture processor (col. 1, lines 29-31).

As to claim 3, Rumreich et al. teaches the user interface sets up the display property values (fig. 3, col. 4, lines 21-29).

As to claim 4, Rumreich et al. teaches an OSD (fig. 2, item 208, col. 2, lines 32-57).

7. Claims 12,18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rumreich et al. in view of Baerlocher (7,004,835 B2).

Rumreich et al. does not disclose a touch screen.

Baerlocher teaches a touch screen (fig. 2,item 52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Baerlocher into Rumreich et al. system in order to pick up the selection (col. 7, lines 49-66 in the Baerlocher reference).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 2,5-6,8-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Relative to claim 2 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Rumreich et al., McNeely et al. and Baerlocher) and the instant invention is a user interface setting up a **type** of the external signal inputter.

Claims 5-6 depend on claim 8.

Relative to claim 8 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Rumreich et al. and Baerlocher) and the instant invention is the storing the display property values **depending on the external signal** inputter is done by a user's selection.

Claim 9 depends on claim 8.


***Telephone Inquire***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 571-272-7683. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS  
06.02.07



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600